<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 15-26 are pending. Claims 1 and 15 are amended. Claims 17-26 are newly added. Claims 4 and 9-14 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The remaining claims are unchanged.

The claim amendments are supported by the application as originally filed, for example, in paragraphs [0147]-[0159] of the published application, Pub No. 2003/001808. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections: 35 U.S.C. § 103

<u>Claims 1-8</u>

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,768 to Zombek et al. (Zombek), U.S. Patent Application Publication 20010005358 (hereinafter Shiozawa), and Official Notice. The Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

The claims have been revised as set forth above to clarify certain features. For instance, new claim 17 defines a method for authenticating services participating in routing of a message in a message routing network that includes the features of:

> **before the routing of the message in the message routing network:**
> **(a) authenticating an enterprise to the message routing network;**
> **(b) associating an identifier with the enterprise when the enterprise is authenticated to the message routing network;**
> **(c) authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider;**
> **(d) associating the identifier with an account of the enterprise when the enterprise is authenticated to the first service provider, such that the identifier represents authentication of the first service provider to the enterprise account;**
> **such that when a message including said identifier is received from a sender of the message, authentication of only said message routing network using the identifier included in the message provides authentication of the sender of the message.**

(Emphasis added).

In embodiments of the method defined in claim 17, for both an enterprise and ASP (application service provider) to trust a GCID (identifier) provided by message interchange network 150, the GCID should be validated by both organizations as representing the enterprise's account on the ASP. Setting up this trust relationship is accomplished through a provisioning process that is completed prior to the routing of messages between the enterprise and the ASP. The process of provisioning a trusted GCID in message interchange network 150 involves two authentication steps: the enterprise first authenticates itself to message interchange network 150 and receives a GCID, then the enterprise authenticates itself to the ASP and associates the GCID with the enterprise's account. (Application as published, paragraph [0149]).

The message routers in Zombek are described as authenticating a client device 112, which originally sent the message. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of the two authentication steps recited in claim 17: "(a) authenticating an enterprise to the message routing network," and "(c) authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider," much less being done "before the routing of the message in the message routing network," as recited in claim 17. Thus, in addition to offering no teachings in this regard, Zombek fails to disclose or suggest additional features of claim 17, such as the possibility of authenticating only the message network using an identifier in the message.

These deficiencies in Zombek are not cured by Shiozawa and the Official Notice. Shiozawa's described packet protection techniques include no mention of authentication processes or techniques, such as the two recited authentication steps before routing the message in the message routing network, as recited in claim 17. The Official Notice is not related to authentication techniques.

Because Shiozawa and the Official Notice fail to disclose or suggest the same claimed features lacking in Zombek, considered alone or in combination under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the cited references fail to make a prima facie case of obviousness of claim 17.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite similar features as new claim 17. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn for similar reasons as above. Claims 2-8 are dependent upon claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 2-8 may also be separately patentable for additional reasons.

Claims 15-16

Claim 15 has been amended to recite similar features as claim 17 and is, therefore, neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Zombek, Shiozawa, and the Official Notice, considered alone or in combination, for similar reasons as described above.

In addition, claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0243574 to Giroux et al. (Giroux) and Zombek. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections for the following reasons.

Paragraph 22 of the Office Action states that "Giroux did not specifically teach authentication." Applicant agrees with this assessment of Giroux.

Because Giroux fails to disclose or suggest authentication, much less the above-quoted features lacking in Zombek, the cited references fail to support the obviousness rejection of claims 15 and 16, considered alone or in combination under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, this rejection should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/John F. Griffith/

John F. Griffith
Reg. No. 44,137

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100